arXiv:0906.2064v2 [math.CA] 8 Sep 2009

# NONLINEAR BRASCAMP–LIEB INEQUALITIES AND APPLICATIONS TO HARMONIC ANALYSIS

JONATHAN BENNETT AND NEAL BEZ

Abstract. We use the method of induction-on-scales to prove certain diffeomorphism invariant nonlinear Brascamp–Lieb inequalities. We provide applications to the multilinear restriction theory for the Fourier transform, and to higher dimensional analogues of a recent convolution inequality of Bejenaru, Herr and Tataru. Our approach builds on work of Bejenaru et al. and Carbery, Wright and the first author.

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to obtain nonlinear generalisations of certain Brascamp–Lieb inequalities and apply them to some well-known problems in euclidean harmonic analysis. Our particular approach to such inequalities is by induction-on-scales, and builds on the recent work of Bejenaru, Herr and Tataru [4].

The Brascamp–Lieb inequalities simultaneously generalise important classical inequalities such as the multilinear Hölder, sharp Young convolution and Loomis–Whitney inequalities. They may be formulated as follows. Suppose $m \geq 2$ and $d, d_1, \ldots, d_m$ are positive integers, and for each $1 \leq j \leq m$, $B_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ is a linear surjection and $p_j \in [0,1]$. The Brascamp–Lieb inequality associated with these objects takes the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m (f_j \circ B_j)^{p_j} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{p_j} \tag{1}$$

for all nonnegative $f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Here $C$ denotes a constant depending on the datum $(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}) := ((B_j), (p_j))$, which at this level of generality may of course be infinite. For nonnegative functions $f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$ satisfying $0 < \int f_j < \infty$, we define the quantity

$$\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f}) = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m (f_j \circ B_j)^{p_j}}{\prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{p_j}},$$

where $\mathbf{f} := (f_j)$. We may then define the Brascamp–Lieb constant $0 < \mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}) \leq \infty$ to be the supremum of $\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f})$ over all such inputs $\mathbf{f}$. The quantity $\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p})$ is of course the smallest $0 < C \leq \infty$ for which (1) holds. The generality of this setup

---

*Date*: 20th August 2009.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 44A12; 42B10; 44A35.

*Key words and phrases.* Brascamp–Lieb inequalities, induction-on-scales, Fourier extension estimates.

Both authors were supported by EPSRC grant EP/E022340/1.

of course raises questions, many of which have been addressed in the literature. In [14] Lieb showed that the supremum above is exhausted by centred gaussian inputs, prompting further investigation into issues including the finiteness of $\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p})$ and the extremisability/gaussian-extremisability of $\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f})$. A fuller description of the literature is not appropriate for the purposes of this paper. The reader is referred to the survey article [2] and the references there.

A large number of problems in harmonic analysis require nonlinear versions of inequalities belonging to this family; see [19], [13], [7], [4] and [3] for instance. We illustrate this claim explicitly in Section 4 of the current paper.

The generalisations we seek here are local in nature, and amount to allowing the maps $B_j$ to be nonlinear submersions in a neighbourhood of a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and then looking for a neighbourhood $U$ of $x_0$ such that if $\psi$ is a cutoff function supported in $U$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ for which

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{p_j} \psi(x)\, dx \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{p_j} \tag{2}$$

for all $f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. The applications of such inequalities invariably require more quantitative statements involving the sizes of the neighbourhood $U$ and constant $C$, and also the nature of any smoothness/non-degeneracy conditions imposed on $\mathbf{B}$.

If $d_j = d$ for all $j$, then the $B_j$ are of course local diffeomorphisms. In this situation necessarily $\sum p_j = 1$, and (2) follows from the $m$-linear Hölder inequality. Similar considerations allow to reduce matters to the case where $d_j < d$ for all $j$.

The Brascamp–Lieb inequalities (1) possess a certain self-similar structure that strongly suggests an approach to the corresponding nonlinear statements by induction-on-scales. [1] This self-similarity manifests itself most elegantly in an elementary convolution inequality due to Ball [1], which we now describe. For inputs $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{f}'$,[2] by Fubini's theorem and elementary considerations we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f})\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f}') &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m (f_j \circ B_j)^{p_j} * \prod_{j=1}^m (f'_j \circ B_j)^{p_j} \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m (g_j^x \circ B_j)^{p_j} \right) dx \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; (g_j^x)) \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} g_j^x(y) dy \right)^{p_j} \right) dx
\end{aligned}$$

---

[1] Induction-on-scales arguments have been used with great success in harmonic analysis in recent years. Very closely related to the forthcoming discussion is the induction-on-scales approach to the Fourier Restriction and Kakeya Conjectures originating in Bourgain [8], and developed further by Wolff (see [20]) and Tao (see [16]). See also the survey article [17].

[2] For clarity of exposition we shall assume that these inputs are $L^1$-normalised here, although the resulting inequality will not require this.

$$\begin{aligned}(3)\qquad &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left( \mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{p};(g_j^x)) \prod_{j=1}^m (f_j * f_j'(B_j x))^{p_j} \right) dx \\ &\leq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{p};(g_j^x))\, \mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{p};\mathbf{f}*\mathbf{f}'),\end{aligned}$$

where $g_j^x(y) := f_j(B_j x - y) f_j'(y)$ and $\mathbf{f}*\mathbf{f}' := (f_j * f_j')$. Notice that if $\mathbf{f}'$ is an extremiser to (1) then we may deduce that

$$\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{p};\mathbf{f}) \leq \sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{p};(g_j^x)). \tag{4}$$

In particular, in the presence of an appropriately "localising" extremiser $\mathbf{f}'$ (such as of compact support), (4) suggests the viability of a proof of nonlinear inequalities such as (2) by induction on the "scale of the support" of $\mathbf{f}$. The point is that $g_j^x$ may be thought of as the function $f_j$ localised by $f_j'$ to a neighbourhood of the general point $B_j x$.

Our aim now is to identify a natural class of Brascamp–Lieb inequalities (1) for which nonlinear versions of the form (2) may be obtained by the method of induction-on-scales. With the above discussion in mind it is natural to restrict attention to data $(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{p})$ for which (1) has extremisers of the form $\mathbf{f} = (\chi_{E_j})$, where for each $j$, $E_j$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ which tiles by translation. Furthermore, given our aspirations, it is necessary that we choose a class of data which is affine-invariant and stable under linear perturbations of $\mathbf{B}$. These requirements lead us to make the additional assumption that the linear mappings $\mathbf{B} = (B_j)$ satisfy

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^m \ker B_j = \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5}$$

The hypothesis (5) is quite restrictive; in particular, it is straightforward to show that $\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B},\mathbf{p})$ is finite only when $p_j = 1/(m-1)$ for every $1 \leq j \leq m$. In order to use this hypothesis we let $X_j(B_j) \in \Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the wedge product[3] of the rows of the $d_j \times d$ matrix $B_j$. By the hypothesis (5),

$$\star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(B_j) \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\},$$

where $\star$ denotes the Hodge star.

**Proposition 1.1.** *Under the above hypotheses,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j x)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx \leq \left| \star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(B_j) \right|^{-\frac{1}{m-1}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \tag{6}$$

*for all nonnegative $f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$.*

**Remark 1.2.** (i) Inequality (6) is affine-invariant and may be reduced (by appropriate linear changes of variables) to the case where the $B_j$ are projections onto coordinate subspaces satisfying $\star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(B_j) = 1$. In this situation (6) may be proved using a nested application of the $(m-1)$-linear Hölder inequality. This proof relies heavily on the linearity of the $B_j$, and breaks down completely in the nonlinear setting. Such linear analysis in the context of more general coordinate subspace projections can be found in Finner [12].

---

[3] Here $\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ denotes the $d_j$'th exterior algebra of $\mathbb{R}^d$.

(ii) The above hypotheses are stable under linear perturbations of the mappings $B_j$. This is a natural feature given that our goal is to treat nonlinear perturbations.

(iii) There are compactly supported extremisers to this inequality. As there are linear changes of variables which reduce inequality (6) to the case where the $B_j$ are coordinate projections, it is straightforward to observe that characteristic functions of certain paralellepipeds are extremisers for (6). Such sets of course tile by translation.

(iv) Inequality (6) may be viewed as a generalisation of the Loomis–Whitney inequality, whereby $m = d$ and $d_j = d - 1$ for all $j$.

(v) There are other hypotheses on the data which fulfill our requirements. For example, one may replace (5) by

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{coker} B_j = \mathbb{R}^d.$$

However, after appropriate changes of variables, the corresponding nonlinear inequality (2) merely reduces to a statement of Fubini's theorem, and in particular, $p_j = 1$ for all $j$. There are further alternatives which are hybrids of these and are similarly degenerate.

Since the inequality (6) is affine-invariant, one should expect it to have a diffeomorphism-invariant nonlinear version. This is our main result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let $\beta, \varepsilon, \kappa > 0$ be given. Suppose that $B_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ is a $C^{1,\beta}$ submersion satisfying $\|B_j\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \kappa$ in a neighbourhood of a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. Suppose further that*

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{m} \ker dB_j(x_0) = \mathbb{R}^d$$

*and*

$$\left| \star \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} \star X_j(dB_j(x_0)) \right| \geq \varepsilon.$$

*Then there exists a neighbourhood $U$ of $x_0$ depending on at most $\beta, \varepsilon, \kappa$ and $d$, such that for all cutoff functions $\psi$ supported in $U$, there is a constant $C$ depending only on $d$ and $\psi$ such that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^{m} f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \psi(x)\, dx \leq C\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{m-1}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \tag{7}$$

*for all nonnegative $f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$.*

The proof of this theorem that we present is based on [4] and provides additional information about the sizes of the neighbourhood $U$ and constant $C$ appearing in its statement. See Section 2 for further details of this.

The above theorem is a local result. It is natural to ask whether one may obtain global versions based on the assumption that hypothesis (5) holds at every point $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ – possibly with the insertion of a suitable weight factor. Simple examples show that naive versions, involving weights which are powers of the quantity $\star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(dB_j(x))$ cannot hold; see [7] for an explicit example.

In the case where $d_j = d-1$ for all $j$, the above theorem reduces to the nonlinear Loomis–Whitney inequality in [7]. It is worth noting that the result of [7] requires the stronger hypothesis that $B_j \in C^3$ rather than merely $B_j \in C^{1,\beta}$ for some $\beta > 0$. The proof of the result in [7] is quite different from the proof we give here, and is based on the so-called method of refinements of M. Christ [11]. It is likely that the method of refinements may also be used to prove Theorem 1.3. We make some further remarks on the role of the smoothness of the mappings $B_j$ at the end of Section 3.

**Remark 1.4.** Notice that if $\mathbf{f}'$ is an extremiser to (1) then we may also deduce from (3) that

$$\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f}) \leq \mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f} * \mathbf{f}'). \tag{8}$$

This inequality suggests the viability of a proof of nonlinear inequalities such as (2) by induction on the "scale of constancy" of $f$. Certain weak versions of inequality (2), where the resulting constant $C$ has a mild dependence on the smoothness of the input $\mathbf{f}$, have already been treated in this way in [6] (see Remarks 6.3 and 6.6).

In certain situations, (8) leads to the monotonicity of $\mathrm{BL}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{p}; \mathbf{f})$ under the action of certain convolution semigroups on the input $\mathbf{f}$. In the context of heat-flow, this observation originates in [10] and [5]; see the latter for further discussion of this perspective.

The proof of Theorem 1.3 proceeds as follows. In Section 2 we show that by making appropriate changes of variables it suffices to consider the case where the linear mappings $dB_j(x_0)$ are certain coordinate projections. Although this reduction is not essential, it does lead to some conceptual and notational simplification in the subsequent analysis. The proof for such mappings rests on an induction-on-scales lemma which is proved in Section 3. Our approach to this induction-on-scales lemma builds on work of Bejenaru, Herr and Tataru [4].

In Section 4 we provide applications to two closely related problems in harmonic analysis.

## 2. Preparation

We shall assume that we are given the setup of Theorem 1.3. Next, we fix $1 \leq j \leq m$ and introduce some notation. Firstly, define

$$\mathcal{K}_j = \{d_1' + \cdots + d_{j-1}' + 1, \ldots, d_1' + \cdots + d_{j-1}' + d_j'\}$$

where $d_j'$ denotes the dimension of the kernel of $dB_j(x_0)$. Now select any set of vectors $\{a_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_j\}$ forming an orthonormal basis for the orthogonal complement of the subspace spanned by the rows of $dB_j(x_0)$. By definition of the Hodge star and orthogonality considerations it follows that

$$\star X_j(dB_j(x_0)) = \|X_j(dB_j(x_0))\|_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{K}_j} a_k. \tag{9}$$

Here, $\|\cdot\|_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} : \Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to [0,\infty)$ is the norm induced by the standard inner product $\langle \cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} : \Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\langle u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge u_{d_j}, v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{d_j}\rangle_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} = \det(\langle u_k, v_l\rangle)_{1 \le k,l \le d_j}.$$

Let $A$ be the $d \times d$ matrix whose $i$th column is equal to $a_i$ for each $1 \le i \le d$. Let $\Pi_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ be the matrix whose $k$th column consists of zeros whenever $k \in \mathcal{K}_j$ and is such that upon deleting such columns one obtains the $d_j \times d_j$ identity matrix. Finally, let $C_j$ be the $d_j \times d_j$ matrix given by

$$C_j = dB_j(x_0)A_j,$$

where $A_j$ is the $d \times d_j$ matrix obtained by deleting from $A$ the columns $a_k$ for each $k \in \mathcal{K}_j$.

Then, by construction, the map $\widetilde{B}_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ given by

$$\widetilde{B}_j(x) = C_j^{-1}B_j(Ax)$$

satisfies

$$d\widetilde{B}_j(\widetilde{x}_0) = C_j^{-1}dB_j(x_0)A = \Pi_j, \tag{10}$$

where $\widetilde{x}_0 = A^{-1}x_0$. The matrices $A$ and $C_j$ are invertible by the hypothesis (5) and since $B_j$ is a submersion at $x_0$. We shall see that Theorem 1.3 is a consequence of the following proposition. Before stating this result, let us denote by $Q(x,R)$ the axis-parallel cube centred at $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with sidelength equal to $R$.

**Proposition 2.1.** *Suppose $\beta, \kappa > 0$ are given and $\alpha_0, \alpha_1$ satisfy $1 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < 1 + \beta$. Let*

$$R_0 = \min\left\{ \left(\frac{c_d}{\kappa}\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\beta-\alpha_1}}, \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{\frac{1}{\min\{\alpha_0-1,\alpha_1-\alpha_0\}}} \right\}. \tag{11}$$

*Suppose that $B_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ is a $C^{1,\beta}$ submersion satisfying $\|B_j\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \le \kappa$ in $Q(x_0,R_0)$ and $dB_j(x_0) = \Pi_j$ for each $1 \le j \le m$. Then for $c_d > 0$ sufficiently small,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \psi(x)\,dx \le \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} 10^d \exp\left( \frac{10^d R_0^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}}{1 - 2^{-\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}} \right) \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$$

*for all cutoff functions $\psi$ supported in $Q(x_0,R_0)$ and nonnegative $f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \le j \le m$.*

Before we continue, some remarks on the roles of the parameters $\alpha_0$ and $\alpha_1$ above are in order. The proof of Proposition 2.1 proceeds by bootstrapping on the scale of the support of the cutoff $\psi$. At scale $R$ (say), the strategy is to decompose the relevant patch of $\mathbb{R}^d$ into parallelepipeds of sidelengths approximately $R^{\alpha_0}$. Due to the nonlinearity of the mappings $B_j$, it is important to separate these parallelepipeds by relatively narrow "buffer zones" of thickness approximately $R^{\alpha_1}$. For $R$ small, this may be reconciled with the condition that $1 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < 1 + \beta$. This particular strategy originates in [4].

*Deduction of Theorem 1.3 from Proposition 2.1.* Let $U$ be some neighbourhood of $x_0$ and $\psi$ a cutoff function supported in $U$. Using $A$ to change variables one obtains

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \psi(x)\,dx = |\det(A)| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \widetilde{\psi}(x)\,dx, \tag{12}$$

where $\widetilde{\psi} = \psi \circ A$ is a cutoff function supported in $A^{-1}U$ and $\widetilde{f}_j = f_j \circ C_j$, $1 \le j \le m$. Of course, we know that $d\widetilde{B}_j(\widetilde{x}_0) = \Pi_j$ by (10). Notice also that

$$\|d\widetilde{B}_j(x) - d\widetilde{B}_j(y)\| = \|C_j^{-1}(dB_j(Ax) - dB_j(Ay))A\| \le C\kappa \|C_j^{-1}\| |x-y|^\beta,$$

where the constant $C$ depends on at most $d$. To show that we may choose the neighbourhood $U$ and the constant in the claimed uniform manner we need to show that suitable upper bounds hold for the norms of $A^{-1}$ and each $C_j^{-1}$.

For $A^{-1}$, we note that

$$\star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(dB_j(x_0)) = \prod_{j=1}^m \|X_j(dB_j(x_0))\|_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{K}_j} a_k$$

by (9) and therefore

$$\star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(dB_j(x_0)) = \det(A) \prod_{j=1}^m \|X_j(dB_j(x_0))\|_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{13}$$

Since $\|B_j\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \le \kappa$ it follows that

$$\left| \star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(dB_j(x_0)) \right| \le C|\det(A)|$$

for some constant $C$ depending on $\kappa$ and $d$. Since each column of $A$ is a unit vector, it follows that the norm of $A^{-1}$ is bounded above by a constant depending on $\varepsilon, \kappa$ and $d$.

For $C_j^{-1}$, we again use (9) to write

$$\begin{aligned} |\det(C_j)| &= \left| \left\langle X_j(dB_j(x_0)), \bigwedge_{l \notin \mathcal{K}_j} a_l \right\rangle_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right| \\ &= \|X_j(dB_j(x_0))\|_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \left| \left\langle \star \Big( \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{K}_j} a_k \Big), \bigwedge_{l \notin \mathcal{K}_j} a_l \right\rangle_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \right| \end{aligned}$$

and therefore, by definition of the Hodge star,

$$|\det(C_j)| = \|X_j(dB_j(x_0))\|_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\det(A)|. \tag{14}$$

By (13),

$$\varepsilon \le C \|X_j(dB_j(x_0))\|_{\Lambda^{d_j}(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})} |\det(A)|,$$

for some constant $C$ depending on $\kappa$ and $d$. It follows that the norm of $C_j^{-1}$ is also bounded above by a constant depending on $\varepsilon, \kappa$ and $d$.

Applying Proposition 2.1 it follows that there exists a neighbourhood $U$ of $x_0$ depending on at most $\beta, \varepsilon, \kappa$ and $d$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \psi(x)\, dx \leq C|\det(A)| \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} \widetilde{f}_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}},$$

where $C$ depends on at most $d$ and $\psi$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \psi(x)\, dx &\leq C \frac{|\det(A)|}{\left(\prod_{j=1}^m |\det(C_j)|\right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \\ &= C \left| \star \bigwedge_{j=1}^m \star X_j(dB_j(x_0)) \right|^{-\frac{1}{m-1}} \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}},\end{aligned}$$

where the equality holds because of (13) and (14). Theorem 1.3 now follows. □

For the various constants appearing in the above proof, one may easily obtain some explicit dependence in terms of the relevant parameters. Combined with Proposition 2.1, this gives additional information on the sizes of the neighbourhood $U$ and constant $C$ appearing in the statement of Theorem 1.3. We do not pursue this matter further here.

## 3. Proof of Proposition 2.1: Induction-on-scales

Before stating the main induction lemma we use to prove Proposition 2.1, we need to fix some further notation. For each $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $M > 0$, let $L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$ denote those nonnegative $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$ satisfying $f(y_1) \leq 2f(y_2)$ whenever $y_1$ and $y_2$ are in the support of $f$ and $|y_1 - y_2| \leq M^{-1}$; that is, those $f$ which are effectively constant at the scale $M^{-1}$. [4] By an elementary density argument, it will be enough to prove Proposition 2.1 for $f_j \in L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, with neighbourhood $U$ and constant $C$ independent of $M$.

For $\beta, \kappa > 0$, $1 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < 1 + \beta$ and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we let $\mathcal{B}(\beta, \kappa, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, x_0)$ be the family of data $\mathbf{B}$ such that $B_j$ belongs to $C^{1,\beta}(Q(x_0, R_0))$ with $\|B_j\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \kappa$ and satisfies $dB_j(x_0) = \Pi_j$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Here, $R_0$ is given by (11).

Now let $C(R, M)$ denote the best constant in the inequality

$$\int_Q \prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx \leq C \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} f_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$$

over all $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\beta, \kappa, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, x_0)$, all axis-parallel subcubes $Q$ of $Q(x_0, R_0)$ with side-length equal to $R$ and all inputs $\mathbf{f}$ such that $f_j$ belongs to $L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$.

---

[4] One may easily check that if $\mu$ is a finite measure on $\mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ then $P^{(d_j)}_{c/M} * \mu \in L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, where $P^{(d_j)}_{c/M}$ denotes the Poisson kernel on $\mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ at height $c/M$. Here $c$ is a suitably large constant depending only on $d_j$.

We note that the constant $C(R,M)$ also depends on the parameters $\beta, \kappa, \alpha_0$ and $\alpha_1$, although there is little to be gained in what follows from making this dependence explicit.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For all* $0 < R \leq R_0$ *we have*

$$C(R,M) \leq (1 + 10^d R^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}) C(2R^{\alpha_0}, M).$$

*Proof.* Suppose $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{B}(\beta,\kappa,\alpha_0,\alpha_1,x_0)$, $Q$ is an axis-parallel subcube of $Q(x_0,R_0)$ with sidelength equal to $R$ and centre $x_Q$, and suppose $\mathbf{f}$ is such that $f_j$ belongs to $L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. We shall prove that

$$\int_{\widetilde{Q}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx \leq (1 + 10^d R^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}) C(2R^{\alpha_0}, M) \prod_{j=1}^m \left( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} \widetilde{f}_j \right)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}, \tag{15}$$

where[5] $\widetilde{B}_j = B_j(\,\cdot + x_Q) - B_j(x_Q)$, $\widetilde{Q} = Q - \{x_Q\}$ and $\widetilde{f}_j = f_j(\,\cdot + B_j(x_Q))$. Notice that (15) is invariant under the transformation $(\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}, \widetilde{Q}) \mapsto (\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{f}, Q)$. Merely for notational convenience, we will prove (15) for $(\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}, \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}, \widetilde{Q})$ rather than $(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{f}, Q)$. Our reduction means in particular that $\widetilde{Q} = Q(0,R)$ and each $\widetilde{B}_j(0) = 0$.

We clarify that our normalisation hypothesis is that

$$d\widetilde{B}_j(x_0 - x_Q) = \Pi_j$$

for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Thus, by the smoothness hypothesis, we have that

$$\|d\widetilde{B}_j(0) - \Pi_j\| \leq \kappa |x_0 - x_Q|^\beta \leq \frac{1}{100^d} \tag{16}$$

for sufficiently small $c_d$. Since

$$\ker \Pi_j = \langle \{e_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_j\} \rangle,$$

it follows that for each $1 \leq k \leq d$ there exist $\widetilde{a}_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$|\widetilde{a}_k - e_k| \leq \frac{1}{10^d}, \tag{17}$$

and

$$\ker d\widetilde{B}_j(0) = \langle \{\widetilde{a}_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_j\} \rangle$$

for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. Here, $e_k$ denotes the $k$th standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

### Step I: Foliations of $\mathbb{R}^d$ using pull-backs of hyperplanes under the $d\widetilde{B}_j(0)$

Let $\sigma : \{1,\ldots,d\} \to \{1,\ldots,m\}$ be the map given by

$$\sigma(\mathcal{K}_j) = \{(j+1) \bmod m\}$$

for each $1 \leq j \leq m$. [6] For each $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we define the set

$$\Sigma(i,\{s\}) = d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)\langle \{\widetilde{a}_k : k \neq i\} \rangle + \left\{ s\, d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0) \left( \star \bigwedge_{k \neq i} \widetilde{a}_k \right) \right\},$$

---

[5] The $\widetilde{B}_j$ and $\widetilde{f}_j$ here should not be confused with the earlier transient use of this notation in Section 2.

[6] As will become apparent, there is some freedom in our choice of this map; all that we require of $\sigma$ is that $j \mapsto \sigma(\mathcal{K}_j)$ is a permutation of $\{1,2,\ldots,m\}$ with no fixed points.

and more generally, for $J \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Sigma(i,J) = \bigcup_{s\in J} \Sigma(i,\{s\}).$$

Since $\ker d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0) \subseteq \langle\{\widetilde{a}_k : k \neq i\}\rangle$, we have that

$$d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)^{-1}\Sigma(i,\{s\}) = \langle\{\widetilde{a}_k : k\neq i\}\rangle + \Big\{s \star \bigwedge_{k\neq i} \widetilde{a}_k\Big\}, \tag{18}$$

which is of course a hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^d$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Similarly, it follows that $\Sigma(i,\{s\})$ is a hyperplane in $\mathbb{R}^{d_{\sigma(i)}}$ for each $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

Now, the set of vectors $\{\star \bigwedge_{k\neq i} \widetilde{a}_k : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is linearly independent since the same is true of $\{\widetilde{a}_1 \dots, \widetilde{a}_d\}$. Consequently, we may decompose $\mathbb{R}^d$ into parallelepipeds whose faces are contained in hyperplanes of the form (18), $1 \leq i \leq d$. We will use this to decompose the cube $\widetilde{Q}$. As we will see, a regular decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ into parallelepipeds of equal size and adapted to a lattice (where for each $i$, the sequence of parameters $s^{(i)}$ that we choose is in arithmetic progression) will not suffice to prove Lemma 3.1. Furthermore, as we have already outlined, the nonlinearity of the mappings $\widetilde{B}_j$ makes it natural to place relatively narrow "buffer zones" between the parallelepipeds. Following the approach in [4] we use a simple pigeonholing argument in Step II below to position the buffer zones in an almost regular manner. This leads to the corresponding decomposition of $\widetilde{Q}$ which we write down in Step III.

### Step II: Choosing where to slice

For each $1 \leq i \leq d$ we claim that there exists a sequence $(s_k^{(i)})_{k\geq 1}$ such that

$$s_k^{(i)} + \tfrac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0} \leq s_{k+1}^{(i)} \leq s_k^{(i)} + R^{\alpha_0} \tag{19}$$

and

$$\int_{\Sigma(i,[s_{k+1}^{(i)}, s_{k+1}^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_1}])} \widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}} \leq 4R^{\alpha_1-\alpha_0} \int_{\Sigma(i,[s_k^{(i)}+\frac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0}, s_k^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_0}])} \widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}}. \tag{20}$$

*Proof.* We shall choose the sequence $(s_k^{(i)})_{k\geq 1}$ iteratively. We begin by choosing $s_1^{(i)}$ to be any real number such that $\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(\widetilde{Q}) \subseteq \Sigma(i,[s_1^{(i)},\infty))$. Suppose that we have chosen $s_1^{(i)},\dots,s_k^{(i)}$ for some $k \geq 1$. Now let $N$ be the largest integer which is less than or equal to $\frac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0-\alpha_1}$. Set $\zeta_0^{(i)} = s_k^{(i)} + \frac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0}$ and then define $\zeta_n^{(i)} = \zeta_{n-1}^{(i)} + R^{\alpha_1}$ iteratively for $1 \leq n \leq N$ so that

$$[s_k^{(i)} + \tfrac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0}, s_k^{(i)} + R^{\alpha_0}] \supseteq [s_k^{(i)} + \tfrac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0}, s_k^{(i)} + \tfrac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0} + NR^{\alpha_1}] = \bigcup_{n=1}^{N} [\zeta_{n-1}^{(i)}, \zeta_n^{(i)}].$$

Then,

$$\int_{\Sigma(i,[s_k^{(i)}+\frac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0}, s_k^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_0}])} \widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}} \geq \sum_{n=1}^{N} \int_{\Sigma(i,[\zeta_{n-1}^{(i)},\zeta_n^{(i)}])} \widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}},$$

and therefore by the choice of $R_0$ in (11) and the pigeonhole principle, there exists $s_{k+1}^{(i)}$ such that (19) holds and

$$\int_{\Sigma(i,[s_k^{(i)}+\frac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0},s_k^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_0}])} \widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}} \geq \tfrac{1}{4}R^{\alpha_0-\alpha_1} \int_{\Sigma(i,[s_{k+1}^{(i)},s_{k+1}^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_1}])} \widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}};$$

that is, (20) also holds. □

### Step III: The decomposition of $\widetilde{Q}$

For each $1 \leq i \leq d$ and $k \geq 1$ let $J(i,k,0)$ and $J(i,k,1)$ be the intervals given by

$$J(i,k,0) = (s_k^{(i)} + \tfrac{2}{3}R^{\alpha_1}, s_{k+1}^{(i)} + \tfrac{1}{3}R^{\alpha_1}]$$

and

$$J(i,k,1) = [s_k^{(i)} + \tfrac{1}{3}R^{\alpha_1}, s_k^{(i)} + \tfrac{2}{3}R^{\alpha_1}].$$

It will be convenient to let $\mathbf{k}$ denote the vector of indices $(k_1,\ldots,k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. The decomposition of $\widetilde{Q}$ we use is given by

$$\widetilde{Q} = \bigcup_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} P_{\mathbf{k}} \quad \cup \quad \bigcup_{n=1}^{2^d-1} \bigcup_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)}, \tag{21}$$

where

$$P_{\mathbf{k}} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{d} d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)^{-1}\Sigma(i, J(i,k_i,0)) \cap \widetilde{Q} \tag{22}$$

and

$$p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{d} d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)^{-1}\Sigma(i, J(i,k_i,\chi_n(i))) \cap \widetilde{Q}.$$

Here, $\{\chi_0,\chi_1,\ldots,\chi_{2^d-1}\}$ denotes the set of all maps from $\{1,\ldots,d\}$ to $\{0,1\}$ and $\chi_0(\{1,\ldots,d\}) = \{0\}$.

The $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ are large parallelepipeds (intersected with $\widetilde{Q}$) which form the main part of our decomposition. The $p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)}$ are small parallelepipeds (intersected with $\widetilde{Q}$) which sit between the $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ and decompose the buffer zones. Of course, $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ is equal to $p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(0)}$, although we shall continue to use the former notation to accentuate the geometry of the decomposition.

### Step IV: Disjointness

In this step we make precise the role of the buffer zones. For each $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $1 \leq n \leq 2^d - 1$ let

$$T(\Pi_j\mathbf{k}) = \bigcup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\ell}\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\\ \Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell}=\Pi_j\mathbf{k}}} P_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}$$

and

$$T^{(n)}(\Pi_j\mathbf{k}) = \bigcup_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\ell}\in\mathbb{Z}^d:\\ \Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell}=\Pi_j\mathbf{k}}} p^{(n)}_{\boldsymbol{\ell}}.$$

It is the disjointness of the images of such sets under the mapping $\widetilde{B}_j$ that is crucial to the induction-on-scales argument which follows in Step V.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Fix $j, n$ with $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $1 \leq n \leq 2^d - 1$. Whenever $\mathbf{k}, \boldsymbol{\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ are such that $\Pi_j\mathbf{k} \neq \Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell}$ then*

$$\widetilde{B}_j(T(\Pi_j\mathbf{k})) \cap \widetilde{B}_j(T(\Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell})) = \emptyset \tag{23}$$

*and*

$$\widetilde{B}_j(T^{(n)}(\Pi_j\mathbf{k})) \cap \widetilde{B}_j(T^{(n)}(\Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell})) = \emptyset \tag{24}$$

To prove Proposition 3.2 we use the following.

**Lemma 3.3.** *For each $1 \leq j \leq m$ there exists a map $\Phi_j : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

(1) $\Phi_j(0) = 0$ *and $d\Phi_j(0)$ is equal to the identity matrix $I_d$;*

(2) $\widetilde{B}_j = d\widetilde{B}_j(0) \circ \Phi_j$;

(3) $\|d\Phi_j(x) - d\Phi_j(y)\| \leq 2\kappa|x-y|^\beta$ *for each $x, y \in \widetilde{Q}$;*

(4) $|x - \Phi_j(x)| \leq 2d\kappa R^{1+\beta}$ *for each $x \in \widetilde{Q}$.*

*Proof.* Let $\widetilde{I}_{d_j}$ be the invertible $d_j \times d_j$ matrix obtained by deleting the $k$th column of $d\widetilde{B}_j(0)$ for each $k \in \mathcal{K}_j$. For $k \in \mathcal{K}_j$ define the $k$th component of $\Phi_j(x)$ to be $x_k$. Define the remaining $d_j$ components of $\Phi_j(x)$ by stipulating that the element of $\mathbb{R}^{d_j}$ obtained by deleting the $k$th components of $\Phi_j(x)$ for $k \in \mathcal{K}_j$ is equal to

$$\widetilde{I}_{d_j}^{-1}\bigg(\widetilde{B}_j(x) - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{K}_j} x_k d\widetilde{B}_j(0)e_k\bigg).$$

Then a direct computation verifies that Properties (1) and (2) hold for $\Phi_j$. Also,

$$\|d\Phi_j(x) - d\Phi_j(y)\| = \|\widetilde{I}_{d_j}^{-1}(d\widetilde{B}_j(x) - d\widetilde{B}_j(y))\| \leq 2\kappa|x-y|^\beta,$$

since $\|\widetilde{I}_{d_j} - I_{d_j}\| \leq 1/10$, and therefore (3) holds. Finally, Property (4) follows from Properties (1) and (3), and the mean value theorem. □

*Proof of Proposition 3.2.* We shall prove (23). It will be clear how to make the minor modifications in order to prove (24).

From the definition of $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ in (22) observe that

$$T(\Pi_j\mathbf{k}) \subseteq \bigcap_{i\notin\mathcal{K}_j} d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)^{-1}\Sigma(i, J(i, k_i, 0)) \cap \widetilde{Q}.$$

The important point here is that since $\{\widetilde{a}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{a}_d\}$ is a linearly independent set we know that

$$\bigcap_{i\notin\mathcal{K}_j} \langle\{\widetilde{a}_r : r \neq i\}\rangle = \langle\{\widetilde{a}_r : r \in \mathcal{K}_j\}\rangle = \ker d\widetilde{B}_j(0).$$

Suppose $\Pi_j\mathbf{k} \neq \Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell}$ and, for a contradiction, suppose that $z = \widetilde{B}_j(x) = \widetilde{B}_j(y)$ where $x \in T(\Pi_j\mathbf{k})$ and $y \in T(\Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell})$. By (18) it follows that for each $i \notin \mathcal{K}_j$ there exist $s^{(i)}(x) \in J(i, k_i, 0)$ and $s^{(i)}(y) \in J(i, l_i, 0)$ such that

$$\Big\langle x, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle = s^{(i)}(x)\Big| \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i} \widetilde{a}_r\Big|^2$$

and

$$\Big\langle y, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle = s^{(i)}(y)\Big| \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i} \widetilde{a}_r\Big|^2.$$

Therefore

$$\Big|\Big\langle x-y, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle\Big| = |s^{(i)}(x) - s^{(i)}(y)|\Big| \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i} \widetilde{a}_r\Big|^2$$

whenever $i \notin \mathcal{K}_j$. Since $\Pi_j\mathbf{k} \neq \Pi_j\boldsymbol{\ell}$ we have that $k_{i_0} \neq \ell_{i_0}$ for some $i_0 \notin \mathcal{K}_j$ which implies that

$$|s^{(i_0)}(x) - s^{(i_0)}(y)| \geq \tfrac{1}{3}R^{\alpha_1}.$$

On the other hand, since $x$ and $y$ belong to the fibre $\widetilde{B}_j^{-1}(z)$ it follows from Lemma 3.3(2) that $\Phi_j(x)$ and $\Phi_j(y)$ belong to $d\widetilde{B}_j(0)^{-1}(z)$. Thus, there exists $x_z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $d\widetilde{B}_j(0)x_z = z$ and

$$\{\Phi_j(x) - x_z, \Phi_j(y) - x_z\} \subseteq \ker d\widetilde{B}_j(0).$$

Since $i_0 \notin \mathcal{K}_j$ and $\ker d\widetilde{B}_j(0) = \langle\{\widetilde{a}_r : r \in \mathcal{K}_j\}\rangle$ it follows that $\star\bigwedge_{r\neq i_0}\widetilde{a}_r$ belongs to the orthogonal complement of $\ker d\widetilde{B}_j(0)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\langle x-y, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle &= \Big\langle x-x_z, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle - \Big\langle y-x_z, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle \\ &= \Big\langle x - (\Phi_j(x) - x_z) - x_z, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle \\ &\qquad - \Big\langle y - (\Phi_j(y) - x_z) - x_z, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle \\ &= \Big\langle x - \Phi_j(x), \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle - \Big\langle y - \Phi_j(y), \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and Lemma 3.3(4) it follows that

$$\Big|\Big\langle x-y, \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r \Big\rangle\Big| \leq 4d\kappa R^{1+\beta}\Big| \star \bigwedge_{r\neq i_0} \widetilde{a}_r\Big|.$$

Since $|\star\bigwedge_{r\neq i_0}\widetilde{a}_r| \geq 1/2$ it follows that $24d\kappa R^{1+\beta} \geq R^{\alpha_1}$. For a sufficiently small choice of $c_d$, this is our desired contradiction. □

### Step V: The conclusion of the proof of Lemma 3.1 via the discrete case

We shall make use of the following discrete version of Proposition 1.1.

**Proposition 3.4.** ([12]) *If $F_j \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}^{d_j})$ is nonnegative for each $1 \leq j \leq m$ then*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m F_j(\Pi_j \mathbf{k})^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \leq \prod_{j=1}^m \Big( \sum_{k_i : i \notin \mathcal{K}_j} F_j(\Pi_j \mathbf{k}) \Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}.$$

From Step III it follows that

$$\int_{\widetilde{Q}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx = \Lambda_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{2^d-1} \Lambda_n$$

where

$$\Lambda_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{P_{\mathbf{k}}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx$$

and

$$\Lambda_n = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx$$

for $1 \leq n \leq 2^d - 1$.

The vectors $\{* \bigwedge_{k\neq i} \widetilde{a}_k \ : 1 \leq i \leq d\}$ are normal vectors to the faces of the parallelepipeds defining $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)}$ and by (17),

$$\Big| * \bigwedge_{k\neq i} \widetilde{a}_k - e_i \Big| \leq \frac{1}{10}.$$

Thus, each $P_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)}$ is contained in an axis-parallel cube with sidelength equal to $2R^{\alpha_0}$.

**The main term: $\Lambda_0$.** It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{P_{\mathbf{k}}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx &\leq C(2R^{\alpha_0}, M) \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m \Big( \int_{\widetilde{B}_j(P_{\mathbf{k}})} \widetilde{f}_j \Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}} \\ &\leq C(2R^{\alpha_0}, M) \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{j=1}^m F_j(\Pi_j \mathbf{k})^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_j(\Pi_j \mathbf{k}) = \int_{\widetilde{B}_j(T(\Pi_j \mathbf{k}))} \widetilde{f}_j.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{P_{\mathbf{k}}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx \leq C(2R^{\alpha_0}, M) \prod_{j=1}^m \Big( \sum_{k_i : i \notin \mathcal{K}_j} \int_{\widetilde{B}_j(T(\Pi_j \mathbf{k}))} \widetilde{f}_j \Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$$

by Proposition 3.4. Consequently, by Proposition 3.2,

$$\Lambda_0 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{P_{\mathbf{k}}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx \leq C(2R^{\alpha_0}, M) \prod_{j=1}^m \Big( \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}} \widetilde{f}_j \Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}. \tag{25}$$

**The remaining terms: the $\Lambda_n$.** To allow us to capitalise on the pigeonholing in Step II we need the following.

**Lemma 3.5.** *For each $1 \leq i \leq d$ we have*

$$d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)^{-1}\Sigma(i, J(i,k_i,1)) \cap \widetilde{Q} \subseteq \widetilde{B}^{-1}_{\sigma(i)}\Sigma(i,[s^{(i)}_{k_i}, s^{(i)}_{k_i} + R^{\alpha_1}]) \cap \widetilde{Q}.$$

*Proof.* Suppose $x \in \widetilde{Q}$ and $d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)x \in \Sigma(i, J(i,k_i,1))$. Write

$$\{1,\dots,d\} \setminus (\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)} \cup \{i\}) = \{n(1),\dots,n(d_{\sigma(i)}-1)\}$$

with $n(r) < n(r+1)$, and let $\widetilde{I}_{d_{\sigma(i)}}$ be the $d_{\sigma(i)} \times d_{\sigma(i)}$ matrix whose $r$th column is equal to

$$d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)\widetilde{a}_{n(r)}$$

for $1 \leq r \leq d_{\sigma(i)} - 1$ and

$$d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0) \star \bigwedge_{l \neq i} \widetilde{a}_l$$

for $r = d_{\sigma(i)}$. Then

$$d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)x = \widetilde{I}_{d_{\sigma(i)}} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ s^{(i)} \end{pmatrix} \tag{26}$$

for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\sigma(i)}-1}$ and $s^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}$.

Since $\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0) = 0$ it follows from the mean value theorem that

$$|\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(x) - d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)x| \leq d\kappa R^{1+\beta}. \tag{27}$$

By (16) and (17) we have that $\widetilde{I}_{d_{\sigma(i)}}$ is an invertible matrix with $\|\widetilde{I}^{-1}_{d_{\sigma(i)}}\| \leq 2$. Therefore, by (26) and (27),

$$\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(x) = \widetilde{I}_{d_{\sigma(i)}} \begin{pmatrix} y + \upsilon \\ s^{(i)} + \zeta^{(i)} \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $(\upsilon, \zeta^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\sigma(i)}}$ with $|\zeta^{(i)}| \leq 2d\kappa R^{1+\beta}$. It follows that

$$s^{(i)}_{k_i} \leq s^{(i)} + \zeta^{(i)} \leq s^{(i)}_{k_i} + R^{\alpha_1}$$

for $c_d$ sufficiently small and hence

$$\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(x) \in \Sigma(i, [s^{(i)}_{k_i}, s^{(i)}_{k_i} + R^{\alpha_1}]),$$

as required. □

Fix $1 \leq n \leq 2^d - 1$ and suppose $1 \leq i \leq d$ is such that $\chi_n(i) = 1$. Exactly as with the term $\Lambda_0$ above, we can use Proposition 3.4 to deduce that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{P^{(n)}_{\mathbf{k}}} \prod_{j=1}^m \widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\, dx \leq C(2R^{\alpha_0}, M) \prod_{j=1}^m \Bigg( \sum_{k_l : l \notin \mathcal{K}_j} \int_{\widetilde{B}_j(T^{(n)}(\Pi_j \mathbf{k}))} \widetilde{f}_j \Bigg)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}.$$

Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\prod_{j=1}^{m}\Big(\sum_{k_l:l\notin\mathcal{K}_j}\int_{\widetilde{B}_j(T^{(n)}(\Pi_j\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_j\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\\
&=\Big(\sum_{k_l:l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}}\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\prod_{j\neq\sigma(i)}\Big(\sum_{k_l:l\notin\mathcal{K}_j}\int_{\widetilde{B}_j(T^{(n)}(\Pi_j\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_j\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\\
&\leq\Big(\sum_{k_l:l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}}\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\prod_{j\neq\sigma(i)}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}}\widetilde{f}_j\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the inequality follows from Proposition 3.2. Since $i\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}$,

$$
\sum_{k_l:l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}}\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}=\sum_{k_i}\sum_{\substack{k_l:\\ l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}\cup\{i\}}}\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}
$$

and furthermore

$$
\bigcup_{\substack{k_l:\\ l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}\cup\{i\}}}T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k})\subseteq d\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(0)^{-1}\Sigma(i,J(i,k_i,1))\cap\widetilde{Q}.
$$

Using Lemma 3.5 we have

$$
\bigcup_{\substack{k_l:\\ l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}\cup\{i\}}}\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k}))\subseteq\Sigma(i,[s_{k_i}^{(i)},s_{k_i}^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_1}])\cap\widetilde{Q}
$$

and therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{k_l:\\ l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}\cup\{i\}}}\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}&\leq\int_{\Sigma(i,[s_{k_i}^{(i)},s_{k_i}^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_1}])}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}}\\
&\leq 4R^{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}\int_{\Sigma(i,[s_{k_i-1}^{(i)}+\frac{1}{2}R^{\alpha_0},s_{k_i-1}^{(i)}+R^{\alpha_0}])}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\chi_{\widetilde{Q}}
\end{aligned}
$$

by Proposition 3.2 and (20). Summing in $k_i$ it follows that

$$
\sum_{k_l:l\notin\mathcal{K}_{\sigma(i)}}\int_{\widetilde{B}_{\sigma(i)}(T^{(n)}(\Pi_{\sigma(i)}\mathbf{k}))}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)}\leq 4R^{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_{\sigma(i)}}}\widetilde{f}_{\sigma(i)},
$$

and consequently
(28)

$$
\Lambda_n=\sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{p_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)}}\prod_{j=1}^{m}\widetilde{f}_j(\widetilde{B}_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\,dx\leq 4R^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}C(2R^{\alpha_0},M)\prod_{j=1}^{m}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}}\widetilde{f}_j\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}.
$$

The inequality (15) follows from (25) and (28). This completes the proof of Lemma 3.1. □

*Proof of Proposition 2.1.* For $0<R\leq R_0\leq(1/4)^{1/\alpha_0-1}$ it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$
C(R,M)\leq(1+10^dR^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}})C(R/2,M). \tag{29}
$$

Applying (29) iteratively $N$ times we see that

$$C(R_0,M)\leq C(R_0/2^N,M)\prod_{l=0}^{N-1}\big(1+10^d(R_0/2^l)^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}\big).$$

The product term is under control uniformly in $N$ because

$$\begin{aligned}\log\prod_{l=0}^{N-1}\big(1+10^d(R_0/2^l)^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}\big)&=\sum_{l=0}^{N-1}\log\big(1+10^d(R_0/2^l)^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}\big)\\&\leq 10^dR_0^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}\sum_{l=0}^{\infty}2^{-\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}l}\\&\leq\frac{10^dR_0^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}}{1-2^{-\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}}.\end{aligned}$$

We claim that $C(R_0/2^N,M)\leq 10^d$ for $N$ sufficiently large. To see this, suppose $\mathbf{B}\in\mathcal{B}(\beta,\kappa,\alpha_0,\alpha_1,x_0)$, $Q=Q(x_Q,R_0/2^N)$ is a subcube of $Q(x_0,R_0)$ and the input $\mathbf{f}$ is such that $f_j$ belongs to $L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1\leq j\leq m$. For any $x\in Q$,

$$|B_j(x)-(B_j(x_Q)+dB_j(x_Q)(x-x_Q))|\leq\kappa|x-x_Q|^{1+\beta}\leq 1/M$$

if $N$ is sufficiently large (depending on $\beta,\kappa,d$ and $M$). Since $f_j\in L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$ it follows that

$$\int_Q\prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\,dx\leq 2^m\int_{Q-\{x_Q\}}\prod_{j=1}^m f_j(\,\cdot+B_j(x_Q))(dB_j(x_Q)x)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\,dx.$$

Now

$$\|dB_j(x_Q)-\Pi_j\|=\|dB_j(x_Q)-dB_j(x_0)\|\leq\frac{1}{100^d},$$

which implies that

$$\star\bigwedge_{j=1}^m\star X_j(dB_j(x_Q))\geq\frac{1}{2},$$

and therefore

$$\int_Q\prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\,dx\leq 10^d\prod_{j=1}^m\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}}f_j\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$$

by Proposition 1.1.

Thus, we have shown that

$$C(R_0,M)\leq 10^d\exp\left(\frac{10^dR_0^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}}{1-2^{-\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}}\right);$$

that is,

$$\int_{Q(x_0,R_0)}\prod_{j=1}^m f_j(B_j(x))^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\,dx\leq 10^d\exp\left(\frac{10^dR_0^{\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}}{1-2^{-\frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_0}{m-1}}}\right)\prod_{j=1}^m\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d_j}}f_j\Big)^{\frac{1}{m-1}}\tag{30}$$

for all $f_j \in L^1_M(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$, $1 \leq j \leq m$. Since the constant in (30) is independent of $M$, it follows that the inequality is valid for all $f_j \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^{d_j})$. This completes our proof of Proposition 2.1. □

**Remark 3.6.** In Theorem 1.3, the smoothness assumption that each mapping $B_j$ belongs to $C^{1,\beta}$ may be weakened. Suppose that each $B_j$ is a $C^1$ submersion in a neighbourhood of $x_0$ such that the modulus of continuity of $dB_j$, which we denote by $\omega_{dB_j}$, satisfies

$$\omega_{dB_j}(R) \leq \kappa\Omega(R),$$

where, for some $0 < \delta < 1$, $\Omega$ satisfies the summability condition

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \Omega(2^{-l})^{1-\delta} < \infty \tag{31}$$

and $\kappa$ is a positive constant. Without significantly altering the above proof, one can show that Theorem 1.3 holds under such a smoothness hypothesis. Of course, Theorem 1.3 corresponds to $\Omega(R) = R^\beta$ with $\beta > 0$. It is of course easy to choose $\Omega$ satisfying $R^\beta = o(\Omega(R))$ as $R \to 0$ for all $\beta > 0$, and still satisfying (31); for example, $\Omega(R) = (\log 1/R)^{-2}$. Naturally, one pays for allowing a lower level of smoothness in the size of the neighbourhood on which the estimate in (7) holds.

## 4. Applications to harmonic analysis

The applications which we present here rest on the following multilinear Radon-like transform estimate which we shall deduce from our nonlinear Brascamp–Lieb inequalities (Theorem 1.3). We note that the case $d = 3$ of Proposition 4.1 below was proved in [7] as a consequence of the nonlinear Loomis–Whitney inequality.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let $\beta, \varepsilon, \kappa > 0$ be given. If $F : (\mathbb{R}^{d-1})^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \kappa$ and*

$$|\det(\nabla_{u_1}F(0), \dots, \nabla_{u_{d-1}}F(0))| > \varepsilon,$$

*then there exists a neighbourhood $V$ of the origin in $(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})^{d-1}$, depending only on $d, \beta, \varepsilon$ and $\kappa$, and a constant $C$ depending only on $d$, such that*

$$\int_V f_1(u_1)\cdots f_{d-1}(u_{d-1})f_d(u_1 + \cdots + u_{d-1})\delta(F(u))\,du \leq C\varepsilon^{-1/(d-1)} \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{(d-1)'} \tag{32}$$

*for all $f_j \in L^{(d-1)'}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})$.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may suppose that there is a point $a$ belonging to a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the origin in $(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})^{d-1}$ (depending on at most $d, \beta, \varepsilon$ and $\kappa$) such that $F(a) = 0$; otherwise the neighbourhood $V$ in the statement of the proposition could be chosen so that the left-hand side of (32) vanishes. By considering a translation taking $a$ to the origin, we may suppose that $a = 0$. (Here we are using the uniformity claim relating to the neighbourhood $V$.)

Furthermore, we may assume that

$$\nabla_{u_j}F(0) = e_j, \tag{33}$$

the $j$th standard basis vector in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, for each $1 \le j \le d-1$. We shall see that the full generality of Proposition 4.1 follows from this case by a change of variables.

Fix $f_j \in L^{(d-1)'}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})$ which we take to be nonnegative without loss of generality. We proceed in a similar way to the proof of Proposition 7 of [7]. Since $\partial_{(u_{d-1})_{d-1}} F(0) = 1$ it follows that there exists a neighbourhood $W$ of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d(d-2)}$ and a mapping $\eta : W \to \mathbb{R}$ such that for each

$$x = (u_1, \dots, u_{d-2}, (u_{d-1})_1, \dots, (u_{d-1})_{d-2}) \in W$$

we have

$$F(x, \eta(x)) = 0. \tag{34}$$

The neighbourhood $W$ depends only on $\beta$ and $\kappa$, and the mapping $\eta$ satisfies $\|\eta\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \le \widetilde{\kappa}$ for some constant $\widetilde{\kappa}$ which depends only on $d, \beta$ and $\kappa$. Our claims follow from the implicit function theorem in quantitative form. For completeness we have included an adequate version in an appendix.

Let $B_j : W \to \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ be given by

$$B_j(x) = (x_{(d-1)j-d+2}, \dots, x_{(d-1)j})$$

for $1 \le j \le d-2$,

$$B_{d-1}(x) = (x_{(d-1)^2-d+2}, \dots, x_{(d-1)^2-1}, \eta(x)),$$

and

$$B_d = B_1 + \cdots + B_{d-1}.$$

We claim that there exists a neighbourhood $U$ of the origin, with $U \subset W$, depending only on $d, \beta$ and $\kappa$, and a constant $C$ depending on $d$, such that

$$\int_U \prod_{j=1}^{d} f_j(B_j(x))\, dx \le C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{(d-1)'}. \tag{35}$$

Since the subspaces $\ker dB_1(0), \dots, \ker dB_d(0)$ are such that at least one pair has a nontrivial intersection, we cannot directly apply Theorem 1.3 to $\mathbf{B} = (B_j)$ in order to prove (35) (except in the special case $d = 3$ – see [7]). It is, however, possible to construct mappings $B_j^{\oplus} : \mathbb{R}^{d(d-2)} \to \mathbb{R}^{(d-1)(d-2)}$ for $1 \le j \le d$ in block form so that

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{d} \ker dB_j^{\oplus}(0) = \mathbb{R}^{d(d-2)}. \tag{36}$$

We fix $1 \le j \le d$ and define $B_j^{\oplus} : \mathbb{R}^{d(d-2)} \to \mathbb{R}^{(d-1)(d-2)}$ as follows. Let $S^{(j)}$ be the $(d-2)$-tuple obtained by deleting $j$ and $j+1 \,(\mathrm{mod}\ d)$ from the $d$-tuple $(1, \dots, d)$. [7] Then define $B_j^{\oplus} : \mathbb{R}^{d(d-2)} \to \mathbb{R}^{(d-1)(d-2)}$ by

$$B_j^{\oplus}(x) = (B_{S_1^{(j)}}(x), \dots, B_{S_{d-2}^{(j)}}(x)).$$

---

[7] There is some freedom in the choice of the $S^{(j)}$; we only require that the components of each $S^{(j)}$ are distinct and that for each fixed $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ there are exactly $d-2$ occurrences of $k$ over all the components of $S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(d)}$.

To see that (36) holds, we compute the required kernels using the fact that

$$\ker dB_j^{\oplus}(0) = \bigcap_{l=1}^{d-2} \ker dB_{S_l^{(j)}}(0)$$

and using straightforward considerations. In order to write these down we write elements of $\mathbb{R}^{d(d-2)}$ as

$$(u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{d-3}, u_{d-2}; \widetilde{u}_{d-1})$$

where each $u_j \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $\widetilde{u}_{d-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-2}$. Then, using (33) and (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\ker dB_1^{\oplus}(0) &= \{(u, -u, 0, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, 0; 0) : u \in \langle e_1 - e_2 \rangle^{\perp}\},\\
\ker dB_2^{\oplus}(0) &= \{(0, u, -u, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, 0; 0) : u \in \langle e_2 - e_3 \rangle^{\perp}\},\\
&\;\;\vdots\\
\ker dB_{d-3}^{\oplus}(0) &= \{(0, 0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0, u, -u; 0) : u \in \langle e_{d-3} - e_{d-2} \rangle^{\perp}\},\\
\ker dB_{d-2}^{\oplus}(0) &= \{(0, 0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, u; (-u_1, \ldots, -u_{d-2})) : u \in \langle e_{d-2} - e_{d-1} \rangle^{\perp}\},\\
\ker dB_{d-1}^{\oplus}(0) &= \{(0, 0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, 0; \widetilde{u}) : \widetilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{d-2}\},\\
\ker dB_d^{\oplus}(0) &= \{(u, 0, 0, 0, \ldots, 0, 0, 0; 0) : u \in \langle e_1 \rangle^{\perp}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

An elementary calculation now shows that (36) holds.

Consequently, it follows from Theorem 1.3 that there exists a neighbourhood $U$ of the origin, depending on $d, \beta$ and $\kappa$, and a constant $C$ depending on $d$, such that

$$\int_U \prod_{j=1}^{d} g_j(B_j^{\oplus}(x))\, dx \le C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|g_j\|_{d-1} \tag{37}$$

for all $g_j \in L^{d-1}(\mathbb{R}^{(d-1)(d-2)})$. Now, if $f_j^{\otimes} \in L^{d-1}(\mathbb{R}^{(d-1)(d-2)})$ is given by

$$f_j^{\otimes} = \bigotimes_{l=1}^{d-2} f_{S_l^{(j)}}^{1/(d-2)}$$

then by construction,

$$\int_U \prod_{j=1}^{d} f_j^{\otimes}(B_j^{\oplus}(x))\, dx = \int_U \prod_{j=1}^{d} f_j(B_j(x))\, dx$$

and

$$\prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j^{\otimes}\|_{d-1} = \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{(d-1)'}.$$

Hence, (35) follows immediately from (37).

Finally, by the mean value theorem, it is easy to see that there is a neighbourhood $V$ of the origin in $(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})^{d-1}$, depending only on $d, \beta$ and $\kappa$, such that

$$\int_V f_1(u_1) \cdots f_{d-1}(u_{d-1}) f_d(u_1 + \cdots + u_{d-1}) \delta(F(u))\, du \le 2 \int_U \prod_{j=1}^{d} f_j(B_j(x))\, dx.$$

Hence, whenever $\nabla_{u_j} F(0) = e_j$ and $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \kappa$ there exists a neighbourhood $V$ of the origin in $(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})^{d-1}$, depending only on $d, \beta$ and $\kappa$, and a constant $C$ depending only on $d$, such that

$$\int_V f_1(u_1) \cdots f_{d-1}(u_{d-1}) f_d(u_1 + \cdots + u_{d-1}) \delta(F(u))\, du \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{(d-1)'} \tag{38}$$

for all $f_j \in L^{(d-1)'}(\mathbb{R}^{d-1})$.

Now suppose that $F : (\mathbb{R}^{d-1})^{d-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \kappa$ and

$$|\det(\nabla_{u_1} F(0), \ldots, \nabla_{u_{d-1}} F(0))| > \varepsilon. \tag{39}$$

Let $A^{\oplus}$ be the block diagonal $(d-1)^2 \times (d-1)^2$ matrix with $d-1$ copies of the matrix

$$A = (\nabla_{u_1} F(0), \ldots, \nabla_{u_{d-1}} F(0))^T$$

along the diagonal. Then, by the change of variables $u \mapsto A^{\oplus} u$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_V f_1(u_1) \cdots f_{d-1}(u_{d-1}) f_d(u_1 + \cdots + u_{d-1}) \delta(F(u))\, du \\ &= |\det(A)|^{-(d-1)} \int_{A^{\oplus}(V)} \widetilde{f}_1(u_1) \cdots \widetilde{f}_{d-1}(u_{d-1}) \widetilde{f}_d(u_1 + \cdots + u_{d-1}) \delta(\widetilde{F}(u))\, du \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{f}_j = f_j \circ A^{-1}$ and $\widetilde{F} = F \circ (A^{\oplus})^{-1}$. The neighbourhood $V$ of the origin shall be chosen momentarily.

By (39) it follows that the norm of $A^{-1}$ is bounded above by a constant depending on only $d$, $\varepsilon$ and $\kappa$. It follows that the same conclusion holds for the $C^{1,\beta}$ norm of $\widetilde{F}$. Since, by construction, $\nabla_{u_j} \widetilde{F}(0) = e_j$, and by (38), it follows that there exists a neighbourhood $V$, depending on only $d, \beta, \varepsilon$ and $\kappa$, and a constant $C$ depending only on $d$, such that

$$\int_{A^{\oplus}(V)} \widetilde{f}_1(u_1) \cdots \widetilde{f}_{d-1}(u_{d-1}) \widetilde{f}_d(u_1 + \cdots + u_{d-1}) \delta(\widetilde{F}(u))\, du \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|\widetilde{f}_j\|_{(d-1)'}.$$

Therefore, by (39),

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_V f_1(u_1) \cdots f_{d-1}(u_{d-1}) f_d(u_1 + \cdots + u_{d-1}) \delta(F(u))\, du \\ &\qquad \leq C |\det(A)|^{-1/(d-1)} \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{(d-1)'} \leq C \varepsilon^{-1/(d-1)} \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{(d-1)'}. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. □

We now turn to the applications of Proposition 4.1.

4.1. **Multilinear singular convolution inequalities.** Given three transversal and sufficiently regular hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{R}^3$, the convolution of two $L^2$ functions supported on the first and second hypersurface, respectively, restricts to a well-defined $L^2$ function on the third. Under a $C^{1,\beta}$ regularity hypothesis and further scaleable assumptions, this was proved by Bejenaru, Herr and Tataru in [4] by an induction-on-scales argument. (It was a desire to explore this approach that led to the current paper.) We note that the inequality underlying this restriction phenomenon also follows from the nonlinear Loomis–Whitney inequality in [7], although under a stronger regularity hypothesis and a *local* transversality condition. Here we show that natural higher dimensional analogues of this phenomenon may be deduced from Proposition 4.1.

For $d \geq 2$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$, let $U_j$ be a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $\Sigma_j : U_j \to \mathbb{R}^d$ parametrise a $C^{1,\beta}$ codimension-one submanifold $S_j$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$. Let the measure $d\sigma_j$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ be given by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \psi(x)\, d\sigma_j(x) = \int_{U_j} \psi(\Sigma_j(x'))\, dx',$$

where $\psi$ denotes an arbitrary Borel measurable function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Observe that $d\sigma_j$ is supported on $S_j$ and has the representation $d\sigma_j(x) = \delta(\Sigma_j(x'))\chi_{U_j}(x')dx$.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose that the submanifolds $S_1, \ldots, S_d$ are transversal in a neighbourhood of the origin, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $p' = (d-1)q'$. Then there exists a constant $C$ such that*

$$\|f_1 d\sigma_1 * \cdots * f_d d\sigma_d\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{L^p(d\sigma_j)} \tag{40}$$

*for all $f_j \in L^p(d\sigma_j)$ with support in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the origin.*

**Remark 4.3.**
(i) The exponents in Theorem 4.2 are optimal, as may be seen by taking $f_j$ to be the characteristic function of a small cap on $S_j$. As such examples illustrate, at this level of multilinearity, the transversality hypothesis prevents any additional curvature hypotheses on the submanifolds $S_j$ from giving rise to further improvement. See [6] for further discussion of such matters.

(ii) Certain bilinear versions of Theorem 4.2 are well-known and discussed in detail in [17]. In particular, it follows from [18] that for transversal $S_1$ and $S_2$ (as above), which are smooth with nonvanishing gaussian curvature, there is a constant $C$ for which

$$\|f_1 d\sigma_1 * f_2 d\sigma_2\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \|f_1\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{3d-2}}(d\sigma_1)} \|f_2\|_{L^{\frac{4d}{3d-2}}(d\sigma_2)}.$$

The exponent $\frac{4d}{3d-2}$ here is optimal given the $L^2$ norm on the left-hand side. The case $d = 3$ of this inequality was obtained previously in [15]. See for instance [9] for earlier manifestations of such inequalities.

(iii) In particular, when $q = \infty$ inequality (40) implies that

$$f_1 d\sigma_1 * \cdots * f_d d\sigma_d(0) \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{L^{(d-1)'}(d\sigma_j)}.$$

By duality, this is equivalent to the statement that, provided $f_1, \ldots, f_{d-1}$ have support restricted to a sufficiently small fixed neighbourhood of the origin, then the multilinear operator

$$(f_1, \dots, f_{d-1}) \mapsto f_1 d\sigma_1 * \cdots * f_{d-1} d\sigma_{d-1}\Big|_{S_d}$$

is bounded from $L^{(d-1)'}(d\sigma_1) \times \cdots \times L^{(d-1)'}(d\sigma_{d-1})$ to $L^{d-1}(d\sigma_d)$. For $d = 3$ this is a local variant of the result in [4].

(iv) The proof of Theorem 4.2 (below) leads to a stronger uniform statement, whereby the sizes of the constant $C$ and neighbourhood of the origin may be taken to depend only on natural transversality and smoothness parameters. We omit the details of this.

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* By multilinear interpolation and the trivial estimate

$$\|f_1 d\sigma_1 * \cdots * f_d d\sigma_d\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{L^1(d\sigma_j)},$$

it suffices to prove Theorem 4.2 for $q = \infty$.

By considering a rotation in $\mathbb{R}^d$, we may assume without loss of generality that the submanifolds $S_j$ are hypersurfaces; i.e. given by $\Sigma_j(x') = (x', \phi_j(x'))$ for $C^{1,\beta}$ functions $\phi_j : U_j \to \mathbb{R}$. Now, for $f_j$ supported on $S_j$ for each $1 \leq j \leq d$, and any $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
&f_1 d\sigma_1 * \cdots * f_d d\sigma_d(y) \\
&= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^d} \prod_{j=1}^{d} f_j(x_j) \delta(x_{jd} - \phi_j(x_j')) \delta(x_1 + \cdots + x_d - y)\, dx_1 \cdots dx_d \\
&= \int_{U_1 \times \cdots \times U_d} \prod_{j=1}^{d} f_j(x_j', \phi_j(x_j')) \delta(x_1' + \cdots + x_d' - y') \delta(\phi_1(x_1') + \cdots + \phi_d(x_d') - y_d)\, dx_1' \cdots dx_d' \\
&= \int_{U_1 \times \cdots \times U_d} \prod_{j=1}^{d} g_j(x_j') \delta(x_1' + \cdots + x_d' - y') \delta(\phi_1(x_1') + \cdots + \phi_d(x_d') - y_d)\, dx_1' \cdots dx_d' \\
&= \int_{U_1 \times \cdots \times U_{d-1}} \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} g_j(x_j') \widetilde{g}_d(x_1' + \cdots + x_{d-1}') \delta(F(x_1', \dots, x_{d-1}'))\, dx_1' \cdots dx_{d-1}'
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$g_j(x_j') := f_j(x_j', \phi_j(x_j')), \quad \widetilde{g}_d(u) := g_d(y' - u)$$

and

$$F(x_1', \dots, x_{d-1}') = \phi_1(x_1') + \cdots + \phi_{d-1}(x_{d-1}') + \phi_d(y' - (x_1' + \cdots + x_{d-1}')) - y_d.$$

Observe that $F \in C^{1,\beta}$ uniformly in $y$ belonging to a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the origin, and that by the transversality hypothesis (combined with the smoothness hypothesis),

$$\det(\nabla_{x_1'} F(0), \cdots, \nabla_{x_{d-1}'} F(0)) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 \\ \nabla\phi_1(0) & \cdots & \nabla\phi_{d-1}(0) & \nabla\phi_d(y') \end{pmatrix} \neq 0$$

similarly uniformly. Theorem 4.2 now follows by Proposition 4.1. $\square$

Estimates of the type (40) are intimately related to the multilinear restriction theory for the Fourier transform, to which we now turn.

4.2. **A multilinear Fourier extension inequality.** Very much as before, let $U$ be a compact neighbourhood of the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ and $\Sigma : U \to \mathbb{R}^d$ parametrise a $C^{1,\beta}$ codimension-one submanifold $S$ of $\mathbb{R}^d$. To the mapping $\Sigma$ we associate the operator $\mathcal{E}$, given by

$$\mathcal{E}g(\xi) = \int_U g(x) e^{i\langle \xi, \Sigma(x)\rangle}\, dx;$$

here $g \in L^1(U)$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We note that the formal adjoint $\mathcal{E}^*$ is given by the restriction $\mathcal{E}^* f = \widehat{f} \circ \Sigma$, where $\widehat{\ }$ denotes the Fourier transform on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The operator $\mathcal{E}$ is thus referred to as an *adjoint Fourier restriction operator* or *Fourier extension operator.*

Suppose that we have $d$ such extension operators $\mathcal{E}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{E}_d$, associated with mappings $\Sigma_1 : U_1 \to \mathbb{R}^d, \ldots, \Sigma_d : U_d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and submanifolds $S_1, \ldots, S_d$.

**Conjecture 4.4** (Multilinear Restriction [7], [6])**.** *Suppose that the submanifolds* $S_1, \ldots, S_d$ *are transversal in a neighbourhood of the origin,* $q \geq \frac{2d}{d-1}$ *and* $p' \leq \frac{d-1}{d} q$*. Then there exists a constant* $C$ *for which*

$$\Big\| \prod_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{E}_j g_j \Big\|_{L^{q/d}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|g_j\|_{L^p(U_j)} \tag{41}$$

*for all* $g_1, \ldots, g_d$ *supported in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the origin.*

**Remark 4.5.** Conjecture 4.4 implies Theorem 4.2. To see this we first observe that for any function $f_j$ on $S_j$, $\widehat{f_j d\sigma_j} = \mathcal{E}_j g_j$ where $g_j = f_j \circ \Sigma_j$. Now, if $2 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $p' = (d-1)q'$, then by the Hausdorff–Young inequality followed by Conjecture 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f_1 d\sigma_1 * \cdots * f_d d\sigma_d\|_{L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)} &\leq \Big\| \prod_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{E}_j g_j \Big\|_{L^{q'}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &\leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|g_j\|_{L^p(U_j)} = C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{L^p(d\sigma_j)}. \end{aligned}$$

This link was observed for $d = 3$ in [4].

In [6] a local form of Conjecture 4.4 was proved with an $\varepsilon$-loss; namely for each $\varepsilon > 0$ the above conjecture was obtained with (41) replaced by

$$\Big\| \prod_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{E}_j g_j \Big\|_{L^{q/d}(B(0,R))} \leq C_\varepsilon R^\varepsilon \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|g_j\|_{L^p(U_j)}, \tag{42}$$

for all $R > 0$.

In [7] the global estimate (41) was obtained for $d = 3$ and $q = 6$. Here we extend this global result to all dimensions.

**Theorem 4.6.** *If $S_1, \ldots, S_d$ are transversal in a neighbourhood of the origin then there exists a constant $C$ such that*

$$\Big\|\prod_{j=1}^{d} \mathcal{E}_j g_j\Big\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|g_j\|_{L^{\frac{2d-2}{2d-3}}(U_j)} \tag{43}$$

*for all $g_1, \ldots, g_d$ supported in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of the origin.*

*Proof.* By Plancherel's Theorem, (43) is equivalent to the estimate

$$\|f_1 d\sigma_1 * \cdots * f_d d\sigma_d\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq C \prod_{j=1}^{d} \|f_j\|_{L^{\frac{2d-2}{2d-3}}(d\sigma_j)},$$

where as before we are identifying $f_j$ with $g_j$ by $g_j = f_j \circ \Sigma_j$. Theorem 4.6 now follows immediately from Theorem 4.2. □

**Remark 4.7.** The Lebesgue exponent $\frac{2d-2}{2d-3}$ on the right-hand side of (43) is best-possible given the $L^2$ norm on the left. Again, at this level of multilinearity, the transversality hypothesis prevents any additional curvature hypotheses from giving rise to further improvement. See [6] for further discussion.

## Appendix

We provide a quantitative version of the implicit function theorem for $C^{1,\beta}$ functions which we used in the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Below we use the notation $B(0, R)$ to denote the open euclidean ball centred at the origin with radius $R > 0$ in either $\mathbb{R}^n$ or $\mathbb{R}$; the dimension of the ball will be clear from the context. Similarly, we denote by $\overline{B}(0, R)$ the closed euclidean ball centred at the origin with radius $R > 0$.

**Theorem 4.8.** *Suppose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta, \kappa > 0$ are given. Let $R_1, R_2 > 0$ be given by*

$$R_1 = \frac{1}{(100\kappa)^{1/\beta}} \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{10\kappa}\right\} \quad \textit{and} \quad R_2 = \frac{1}{(100\kappa)^{1/\beta}}. \tag{44}$$

*If $F : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is such that $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \kappa$, $F(0, 0) = 0$ and $\partial_{n+1} F(0, 0) = 1$ then there exists a function $\eta : B(0, R_1) \to \overline{B}(0, R_2)$ such that*

$$F(x, \eta(x)) = 0 \quad \textit{for each } x \textit{ belonging to } B(0, R_1),$$

*and a constant $\widetilde{\kappa}$, depending on at most $n, \beta$, and $\kappa$, such that $\|\eta\|_{C^{1,\beta}} \leq \widetilde{\kappa}$.*

*Proof.* The proof proceeds via a standard fixed point argument applied to the map $\Psi_x : \overline{B}(0, R_2) \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\Psi_x(\eta) = \eta - F(x, \eta)$$

for fixed $x \in B(0, R_1)$. We shall prove that $\Psi_x$ is a contraction which maps $\overline{B}(0, R_2)$ to itself.

Let $\Phi : (\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R})^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ be the map given by

$$\Phi((x_1, \eta_1), (x_2, \eta_2)) = \frac{F(x_2, \eta_2) - F(x_1, \eta_1) - dF(x_1, \eta_1)(x_2 - x_1, \eta_2 - \eta_1)}{|(x_2 - x_1, \eta_2 - \eta_1)|}$$

whenever $(x_1,\eta_1),(x_2,\eta_2)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}$ are distinct, and zero otherwise. By the mean value theorem and the fact that $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}}\leq\kappa$ it follows that $\Phi$ is everywhere continuous and

$$|\Phi((x_1,\eta_1),(x_2,\eta_2))|\leq 1/4 \quad \text{for all} \quad (x_j,\eta_j)\in\overline{B}(0,R_2)\times\overline{B}(0,R_2). \tag{45}$$

For each $\eta_1,\eta_2\in\overline{B}(0,R_2)$ we have

$$\Psi_x(\eta_1)-\Psi_x(\eta_2)=(1-\partial_{n+1}F(x,\eta_1))(\eta_1-\eta_2)+\Phi((x,\eta_1),(x,\eta_2))|\eta_1-\eta_2|.$$

Since $\partial_{n+1}F(0,0)=1$ and $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}}\leq\kappa$ it follows that

$$|1-\partial_{n+1}F(x,\eta)|\leq 1/4 \quad \text{whenever} \quad (x,\eta)\in\overline{B}(0,R_2)\times\overline{B}(0,R_2). \tag{46}$$

Hence, by (45) and (46) it follows that

$$|\Psi_x(\eta_1)-\Psi_x(\eta_2)|\leq\tfrac{1}{2}|\eta_1-\eta_2| \tag{47}$$

and $\Psi_x$ is a contraction.

Now let $\eta\in\overline{B}(0,R_2)$. Using the hypothesis $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}}\leq\kappa$, along with (47) and (44), it follows that

$$|\Psi_x(\eta)|\leq|\Psi_x(\eta)-\Psi_x(0)|+|\Psi_x(0)|\leq R_2.$$

Hence $\Psi_x(\overline{B}(0,R_2))\subseteq\overline{B}(0,R_2)$. By the Banach fixed point theorem, there exists a mapping $\eta:B(0,R_1)\to\overline{B}(0,R_2)$ such that $\Psi_x(\eta(x))=\eta(x)$, or equivalently $F(x,\eta(x))=0$, for each $x\in B(0,R_1)$.

It remains to show that $\eta$ belongs to $C^{1,\beta}$ and $\|\eta\|_{C^{1,\beta}}\leq\widetilde{\kappa}$ for some constant $\widetilde{\kappa}$ depending on at most $n,\beta$ and $\kappa$. To see that $\eta$ is differentiable, fix $x,h\in B(0,R_1)$ such that $x+h\in B(0,R_1)$. Since $F(x+h,\eta(x+h))=F(x,\eta(x))$ it follows that

$$dF(x,\eta(x))(h,\eta(x+h)-\eta(x))+\Phi((x,\eta(x)),(x+h,\eta(x+h)))|(h,\eta(x+h)-\eta(x))|=0$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_{n+1}F(x,\eta(x))(\eta(x+h)-\eta(x))\\&\quad=-\langle\nabla_xF(x,\eta(x)),h\rangle-\Phi((x,\eta(x)),(x+h,\eta(x+h))|(h,\eta(x+h)-\eta(x))|.\end{aligned}$$

Note that by (45) and (46) it follows that

$$|\eta(x+h)-\eta(x)|\leq C|h|$$

for some finite constant $C$ independent of $h$. Moreover, $\Phi$ is continuous and vanishes along the diagonal. It follows that $\eta$ is differentiable at $x$ and

$$\nabla\eta(x)=-\frac{\nabla_xF(x,\eta(x))}{\partial_{n+1}F(x,\eta(x))}.$$

Using $\|F\|_{C^{1,\beta}}\leq\kappa$ and (46) one quickly obtains the inequality $\|\eta\|_{C^{1,\beta}}\leq\widetilde{\kappa}$ for some constant $\widetilde{\kappa}$ depending only on $n,\beta$ and $\kappa$. $\square$

## References

[1] K. Ball, *Volumes of sections of cubes and related problems*, Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis (J. Lindenstrauss, V. D. Milman, eds.) Springer Lecture Notes in Math. **1376** (1989), 251–260.

[2] F. Barthe, *The Brunn–Minkowski theorem and related geometric and functional inequalities*, International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II, 1529–1546, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006.

[3] I. Bejenaru, S. Herr, J. Holmer, D. Tataru, *On the 2d Zakharov system with $L^2$ Schrödinger data*, Nonlinearity **22** (2009), 1063–1089.

[4] I. Bejenaru, S. Herr, D. Tataru, *A convolution estimate for two-dimensional hypersurfaces*, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana (to appear), arXiv:0809.5091.

[5] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, M. Christ, T. Tao, *The Brascamp–Lieb inequalities: finiteness, structure and extremals*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **17** (2007), 1343–1415.

[6] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, T. Tao, *On the multilinear restriction and Kakeya conjectures*, Acta Math. **196** (2006), 261–302.

[7] J. Bennett, A. Carbery, J. Wright, *A nonlinear generalisation of the Loomis–Whitney inequality and applications*, Math. Res. Lett. **12** (2005), 443–457.

[8] J. Bourgain, *Besicovitch-type maximal operators and applications to Fourier analysis*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **22** (1991), 147–214.

[9] J. Bourgain, *On the restriction and multiplier problem in $\mathbb{R}^3$*, Lecture notes in Mathematics, **1469**, Springer Verlag, 1991.

[10] E. A. Carlen, E. H. Lieb, M. Loss, *A sharp analog of Young's inequality on $S^N$ and related entropy inequalities*, Jour. Geom. Anal. **14** (2004), 487–520.

[11] M. Christ, *Convolution, curvature, and combinatorics: a case study*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **19** (1998), 1033–1048.

[12] H. Finner, *A generalization of Hölder's inequality and some probability inequalities*, Ann. Probab. **20** (1992), 1893–1901.

[13] P. T. Gressman, *$L^p$-improving estimates for averages on polynomial curves*, arXiv:0812.2589.

[14] E. H. Lieb, *Gaussian kernels have only Gaussian maximizers*, Invent. Math. **102** (1990), 179–208.

[15] A. Moyua, A. Vargas and L. Vega, *Restriction theorems and maximal operators related to oscillatory integrals in $\mathbb{R}^3$*, Duke Math. J. **96** (1999), 547–574.

[16] T. Tao, *A sharp bilinear restriction estimate for paraboloids*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **13** (2003), 1359–1384.

[17] T. Tao, *Recent progress on the restriction conjecture*, Park City Proceedings, arXiv:math/0311181.

[18] T. Tao, A. Vargas and L. Vega, *A bilinear approach to the restriction and Kakeya conjectures*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **11** (1998), 967–1000.

[19] T. Tao and J. Wright, *$L^p$ improving bounds for averages along curves*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003), 605–638.

[20] T. H. Wolff, *A sharp bilinear cone restriction estimate*, Ann. of Math. **153** (2001), 661–698.

Jonathan Bennett, School of Mathematics, The Watson Building, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, England.

*E-mail address*: `J.Bennett@bham.ac.uk`

Neal Bez, Department of Mathematics, University Gardens, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, G12 8QW, Scotland.

*E-mail address*: `n.bez@maths.gla.ac.uk`